DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 269 351 SP 027 247

AUTHOR Rhoades, Gary
TITLE The Costs of Academic Excellence in Teacher Education. Working Paper #5.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Santa Barbara. Graduate School of Education.
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 64p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Comparative Analysis; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *England

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a comparative analysis of teacher education in England and the United States. The fundamental focus is on the location of teacher education in the educational system, and what effect this has on teacher education programs. First considered is the organizational setting in which secondary school teachers are trained, and in what sorts of institutions the training takes place. In this area, the following questions are asked: (1) does training take place in research universities, comprehensive state colleges and universities, polytechnics, monotechnic teachers colleges, or in school-based institutions? and (2) in what sorts of units within these institutions are teachers trained--separate professional schools, departments of education within colleges of letters, or mainstream disciplinary departments? The second dimension of location considered is the normative setting in which secondary school teachers are trained, to what extent a traditional academic ideology prevails in the institutions, and the basic units in which they are trained. Reference is made to the values and beliefs typical of academics in the mainstream college of letters and science departments: beliefs about what type of educational content and work has value, what should be taught, how students should be trained, and what students should be encouraged to do. Eight pages of references are appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Working Paper #5

THE COSTS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Gary Rhoades

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. R. Clark

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Working Paper #5

THE COSTS OF ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Gary Rhoades

November 1985

Gary Rhoades
Research Associate
Comparative Higher Education Research Group

The research and reflection reported in this paper has been part of the work conducted by the UCLA Comparative Higher Education Research Group. It has been supported by funds from the Lilly Endowment for a cross-national study of the relation between secondary and higher education.

In the interest of fullest possible circulation of information and ideas, the Comparative Higher Education Research Group reproduces and circulates these Working Papers at the request of authors who are affiliated with the Group. The views expressed are those of the author.

Copies of the Working Papers are distributed without charge to those scholars, administrators, and librarians who have indicated they would like to be on our international mailing list. Copies of particular papers may be obtained upon request by writing to the address below.

Comparative Higher Education Research Group
Graduate School of Education
320 Moore Hall
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

The Costs of Academic Excellence in Teacher Education

Gary Rhoades

The recurring debate in the United States surrounding teacher training, particularly of secondary school teachers, has long centered on promoting academic excellence in teacher education. Reforms proposed in the current cycle of this debate are no exception. Quality is regarded as a major problem in teacher education. And quality is measured in academic terms: that is, the students that teacher education attracts; the programs of study these students follow; and the staff who conduct the programs and educate the students.

Several initiatives have been proposed to remedy these weaknesses: various programs and scholarships to attract more academically able students to teaching careers; more intensive and/or more extensive, teacher education programs of study;[1] and changed state certification requirements which encourage study in the disciplines rather than professional studies courses.[2] There is also a sense that more demanding academic standards must be applied to teacher education staff, not just to its recruits and graduates. In general, more attention and resources have been directed towards these input and output factors. The process of teacher education has been relatively ignored. For instance, federal money is used for scholarships to attract academically talented students to teacher education, but there is no funding for institutions to improve the teacher education programs these students will take (Chronicle of Higher Education, April 4, 1984c).

A basic problem is that teacher education finds itself positioned between two worlds, that of higher education and that of the school. In a modern reenactment of a medieval form of execution, teacher education

is constantly being drawn and quartered. Higher education and the schools each make their own demands on teacher education, pulling it in opposite directions. The dilemma confronting teacher education is which way should it turn.

The solution, as proponents of academic excellence in teacher education see it, is to bring teacher education more closely into the orbit of higher education. But this raises a distinct problem in the American context. Here there is no one "university world," let alone one "higher education world." Our post-secondary system is made up of a wide range of institutional types and sectors with very different missions. And teacher education is spread throughout virtually all of the system.

Some believe that if academic excellence is to be ensured then teacher education must be undertaken only in the best universities. It is not surprising that a principal advocate of this approach is British (Judge 1982). In England, as in most of Western Europe, the training of secondary school teachers is organized differently than in the United States. The emphasis there is more on discipline based study in quality universities, and on traditional notions of academic excellence.

Should we aim, by stressing academic excellence, to recreate a similar system of secondary school teacher training in the United States? First we should consider the educational and professional costs of emphasizing academic excellence.[3] And we should reconsider to what extent and at what price traditional academic quality concerns are already stressed in American teacher education.

These concerns recommend a comparative analysis of English and American secondary school teacher education.[4]

Location of Teacher Education

The fundamental analytical focus of this paper is on the location of teacher education in the educational system. What effects does this have on teacher education programs? Two dimensions of location are considered. First is the organizational setting in which secondary school teachers are trained. In what sorts of institutions does training take place? Is it in research universities, comprehensive state colleges and universities, polytechnics, monotechnic teachers colleges, or in schools-based institutions? And in what sorts of units within these institutions are teachers trained? Is it in separate professional schools, in departments of education within colleges of letters, or in mainstream disciplinary departments?

The second dimension of location is the normative setting in which secondary school teachers are trained. To what extent does a traditional academic ideology prevail in the institutions and basic units in which secondary school teachers are trained? Reference here is to the values and beliefs typical of academics in the mainstream college of letters and science departments: beliefs about what type of educational content and work has value, what should be taught, how students should be trained, and what students should be encouraged to do.

The distinction between organizational and normative location is important. Teacher training could be conducted "outside" the university organizationally, yet "inside" it normatively, either in a school or non-university higher education setting in which the values and beliefs of university academics dominate. Similarly, teacher training might take place "inside" the university organizationally, yet "outside" it normatively, with teacher education staff characterized by more of a

professional than an academic ideology--directed to the needs and demands of schooteachers, not academics.

Models of Teacher Education

In England and the United States the location of secondary school teacher education is related to the model of professional education that is dominant. There is a divergence between the views and preferences of academics and those of practicing professionals regarding professional education. Endemic to all professional education is the tension generated by the often conflicting demands of the academic and the professional world (Hughes 1963; Glazer 1974).[5]

The dichotomy between academic and professional models of teacher education is basic and is grounded in different kinds of preparation for professional practice. The academic model is biased towards conventional academic coursework, generally directed towards abstract concepts and theories that can be applied by future professionals to improve on present practices. The professional model is geared to training by gradually having students take on the responsibilities and make the judgments characteristically undertaken by practicing professionals. This training by doing is geared to reproducing good professional practice.

In the case of teacher education, the higher education and secondary education worlds correspond to the academic and professional worlds respectively. In both England and the United States higher education is clearly winning this tug of war between two worlds. However, the balance between the demands of higher and secondary education is different in the two systems. And higher education in the two systems organizes and provides secondary teacher education differently.

Teacher education is shaped in different ways by the English and American systems. A more traditional academic model is dominant in England, and this has costs in the socialization and preparation of future professionals. In the United States teacher education programs are also academically oriented, although they incorporate more emphasis on professional studies than is the case in England. This too has costs in teacher socialization and preparation.

So there are different degrees and different kinds of academically oriented professional education. And these have quite different effects, as the English and American cases reveal.

Organizational Setting

United States

Location in secondary and higher education. Teacher education in the United States is divided between the schools and higher education. But it is concentrated in primarily in the latter.

Every state in the country requires a period of student teaching that is school based.[6] While there is considerable variance in its organization and administration, the master teachers in the schools provide the day-by-day oversight. And they have the most influence on the student teaching experience (Haberman 1983).

School-based student teaching is a smaller part of a future teacher's professional education than professional studies courses.[7] The student teaching component makes up about 41 percent of professional preparation work (Howey 1983).

More importantly, both student teaching and professional studies make up less than 25 percent of an undergraduate's higher education career (Howey 1983). Future teachers' attitudes and approach to education are shaped not just by their professional education program but their entire higher education careers.[8] The teacher education tradition in the United States has long emphasized a general, liberal arts education as a critical part of a future teacher's education.

The split between the schools and higher education in the professional education of teachers is striking. In contrast to some professional education, the practical experience takes place in a context that is separate from higher education administratively and otherwise. For instance, the clinical part of medical education takes place largely in teaching hospitals that are either owned by or are very closely linked to the university. But the time has long passed since institutions of higher education or schools of education have owned or administered laboratory schools where secondary school teachers are trained.[9]

This highlights and exacerbates the tension between the academic and professional worlds' demands on teacher education. Academics emphasize education; preparing professionals who can monitor and evaluate their own behavior and can adjust their teaching accordingly. In the schools-based component of teacher education, academics' concern is with the student working to become a professional. The schools, on the other hand, are concerned primarily with the students in their classrooms. Their emphasis is on training. Practice teaching is oriented towards perfecting the correct behavior of future professionals.

It is the academic world that exerts the greater pull on teacher education.

Diversity of higher education location. The higher education world in the United States is large and diverse. So is the world of American teacher education.

Teacher education is large in absolute numbers of organizational settings. In the early 1960s more than 1100 institutions of higher education were involved in teacher education (Conant 1963). Today the figure is 1200 institutions (Sykes 1983).

There is also great diversity in that a wide range of higher education institutions are heavily involved in training high school teachers. Among the top twenty institutions in 1966 in terms of the number of high school teachers they trained were: Indiana University, Michigan State University, and the University of Texas - all major state research universities; Southern Illinois University - Carbondale, Ball State University, and North Texas State University - all state universities geared more to regional, service misssions; Montclair State College and Mankato State College - upwardly mobile teachers' colleges (Mankato has since become a university); and Brigham Young University - a private institution (Harcelroad et al., 1969:95). With the exception of two-year colleges, teacher education is distributed throughout the many higher education worlds in the American system.[10]

The roots of some of these higher educational worlds lie in the school. For instance, Chicago State University began as a normal school that was part of the city high school system. Over one-third of today's state colleges and universities were once teachers' colleges and before that were normal schools, equated with secondary education (Harcelroad et al., 1969:15).[11] They were generally administered not by higher education but by city and state boards of education that oversaw the schools.

But the time has long passed since teachers' colleges trained most teachers. In the early 1960s three-quarters of the four-year colleges and universities were in the business of preparing teachers (Conant 1963).[12] Today teacher education is conducted by about 60 percent of all four-year colleges and universities.

These institutions graduate different numbers of teachers. More than three-fourths of all new teachers are now prepared by public institutions, despite the fact that 65 percent of the institutions engaged in teacher preparation are private (Sykes 1983). The pattern of public sector domination has increased since the early 1960s, when public institutions prepared two-thirds of all new teachers (Haberman and Stinnett 1973:59). But there is still considerable diversity in terms of teachers' higher educational background. In 1958, 17.6 percent of new high school teachers graduated from teachers' colleges, 45.1 percent from general or liberal arts colleges, and about 37 percent from universities (Haberman and Stinnett 1973:59). Though there are now fewer teachers' colleges, this diversity persists.

Another dimension of diversity is the sub-institutional setting in which secondary school teachers are educated. In liberal arts colleges teacher education is organized in separate departments of education, or in departments within any number of different divisions - ranging from professional studies or social studies to education and psychology or teacher education. A few liberal arts colleges have separate schools of education.[13]

This same hodgepodge of departmental, divisional, and separate school organization is found in other colleges and universities. However, the nature of these sub-institutional units varies by institutional

type. A department of education in a liberal arts college is generally different from an education department in a major research university. And there are different types of schools of education. Some cater to both undergraduates and graduates, whereas others are graduate schools of education.

These sub-institutional units are separate, to varying degrees, from subject based departments in the rest of the institution. So although teacher education is located in the college or the university, it is not located in traditional discipline based fields. For instance, a future high school history teacher may do much of his/her bachelor's work in an education department or school.

This relationship between these teacher education units and the rest of the campus is critical. Generally, this relationship is not particularly close. For instance, a series of conferences in 1958, 1959, and 1960 called by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (TEPS) promoted and generated the development in a number of colleges and universities of interdepartmental committees on teacher education. But after an initial period of enthusiam the participation of academics outside education departments declined considerably (Woodring 1975). The decline was such that a recent call for "essential reform in teacher education" promoted the idea of creating teacher education coordinating committees with representatives from a variety of constituencies, including academics from subject-based departments.

So the organizational location of secondary school teacher education is characterized by diversity and isolation, in higher education.

England

The European context. To speak of teacher training in much of Western Europe is really to speak of the training of primary school teachers. These teachers are trained in a parallel sector of specialist non-university institutions, somewhat similar to American "normal schools." Professional preparation for secondary school teachers is virtually equated with and confined to academic preparation in a discipline.

Secondary school teachers, particularly at the upper secondary level, are generally university graduates, and their professional preparation is university-based (Clark N.D.). Only a minimal amount of professional training is required after receiving a degree in an academic subject.

England diverges somewhat from this Continental European mode. There is not the extreme separation of primary and secondary school teacher preparation. Teachers of both levels are sometimes trained in the same institution. There has also been a tradition of providing some secondary school teachers with some professional training. In the early 20th century university education departments began to concentrate on the training of secondary school teachers.[14]

Nevertheless, until 1973 many secondary school teachers lacked any pre-service professional training. It was not required (Lomax 1973). Being a university graduate was sufficient. From 1973 until only very recently professional training was not required for secondary school teachers in the "public" schools, nor was it required for math and science teachers in any secondary schools (King 1982).

So in speaking of teacher training in England, as in Continental Europe, one has in the past been speaking principally about the professional education of future primary school teachers.

Location in secondary and higher education. Higher education and the schools each have teacher education responsibilities in England. But secondary school teacher education is primarily concentrated in the higher education sector.

School-based practice teaching is a basic component of teacher education in England. Since higher education institutions do not have model schools for practice teaching, the day-by-day supervision provided by master teachers in the schools is the dominant feature and influence in this experience.

However, as in the United States, practice teaching is a relatively minor part of the future teacher's higher education career.[15] The requirement is for practice teaching of anywhere from twelve to fifteen weeks. This has remained much the same over the decades.[16]

As in the United States, the split between the schools and higher education sectors is plain in the different aims and perspectives of master teachers and college supervisors. Cope (1973) found that only 20 percent of teachers, 17 percent of college staff, and 6 percent of students agreed with the statement, "Teachers approve of the methods advocated by college lecturers." There is no working partnership between the schools and higher education. As a result, the two elements of teacher education, as in the United States, are not integrated. Nor do they reinforce one another.

Minimal diversity in higher education location. English teacher education is characterized by a minimal amount of diversity. And what diversity exists is highly coordinated.

Secondary school teachers in England are trained in both the university and non-university sectors. But most of them, particularly in the specialist academic subjects, are prepared in the universities. Less than half of Britain's 30 polytechnics are involved in training secondary school teachers. Similarly, only about 40 percent of the 70 colleges and institutes of higher education train secondary school teachers. England's binary system of higher education is reproduced in a binary system of teacher education, in that the public sector prepares most of the primary school teachers and the university sector prepares most of the secondary school teachers (Taylor 1982).

There are two main routes of obtaining a secondary school teaching credential in England. One is to take a three or four year bachelor's degree in education (B.Ed.). Such courses began only in the late 1960s. It is a relatively minor route for secondary school teaching, especially for teachers of academic subjects, and recruitment to these courses is well below the original targets (Taylor 1982). And it is a route that is in the process of being phased out at the secondary level, with the number of B.Ed. places being significantly reduced (Times Higher Education Supplement No. 514, 1982, p. 9). The major route is to get a postgraduate certificate in education (PGCE) by taking a one year postgraduate course after obtaining a bachelor's degree.

The subordinate role of public sector institutions is evident in the kind of training they provide. The B.Ed. places are concentrated in public sector institutions. They are now to be offered in only seven subjects, only two of which are main academic subjects - science and maths (in which there is a shortage of teachers). Of the 1300 B.Ed. entry places in these institutions, 350 are in physical education, 315

are in home economics, 215 are in craft, design and technology, and 90 are in religious education. So about 70 percent of these places are in subjects that are far from being the heart of the English secondary school curriculum.

Universities offer the majority of courses in what is the dominant route. Only two public sector institutions will offer PGCE courses in the full range of eleven subjects. Most will offer them in only five.

There are far fewer institutions involved in training secondary school teachers in England than in the United States. Of course, this is because the English higher education system is smaller than the American and secondary school teacher education is concentrated in one higher education sector. As in the United States, the majority of universities are involved in training secondary school teachers. But there are only 45 universities in the British system.

So the work of preparing secondary school teachers is concentrated in a relatively compact university sector. More importantly, it is a rather undifferentiated university sector. Universities in England are not characterized by the steep hierarchy that typifies American universities. One can distinguish between Oxbridge, the civics, the plateglass universities, and the ex-CATS. But these do not constitute formally distinct sectors. There is a hierarchy in England. But it is a far flatter hierarchy than one finds in the United States.

There is a degree of diversity in the English system. But considerable cooperation counterbalances the little diversity of organizational setting that does exist. Universities are assumed to be the suitable guardians of good teacher education, as they are believed to be guardians and seats of academic quality. This assumption translates into practice.

For instance, professional studies are largely devised by members of university departments of education. And most of secondary school teacher training is formally coordinated by university schools and institutes of education.

There is also considerable coordination within universities between teacher education units and the rest of the campus. As in the United States, teacher education in England is undertaken by units that are separate from the subject based departments. But in England teacher education is more centered in the traditional university in two ways.

First, future teachers who follow the main route for obtaining a secondary school teaching credential (the PGCE) do all of their bachelor's work in discipline-based departments. The sub-institutional units involved in teacher education are not departments compacting with disciplinary departments. They are schools or institutes operating purely at the graduate level. There is not the diversity of sub-institutional setting that one finds in the United States.

Second, teacher education units in England are separate but not isolated. This is due to the nature of the university governance system in England, which has been characterized as a "republican democracy" (Moodie and Eustace 1974). English university academics, unlike their American counterparts, are very actively involved in the administration and running of their institutions (see Perkin 1969; 1977). The academic senate is the dominant force on campus (Moodie and Eustace 1974; Caston 1979). Collegial coordination throughout the institution is a commonplace part of English university governance. This extends to units involved in teacher education. Such campus-wide involvement has been detailed by Howell (1976; 1979) in the case of universities developing the innovative B.Ed. in the late 1960s.

So, in both the United States and England secondary school teacher education is centered primarily in higher education, although the important practice teaching experience takes place in the schools, relatively separated from higher education. However, in the United States teacher education is distributed throughout a number of higher education worlds, whereas in England it is concentrated in the relatively homogeneous university world. And to the extent that there is diversity of organizational location in England, it has been coordinated by the university world.

The Teacher Education Program

To what extent does the organizational structure of teacher education affect the content of teacher education programs? The contrasting organizational settings of teacher training in the United States and England are correlated with somewhat different teacher education programs. Each emphasize academic models. But the models are somewhat different. And there is a different balance of emphasis on academic versus professional models of teacher education. Yet within the United States , despite the tremendous diversity of organizational setting, the basic elements of the formal teacher education program are fairly standard nationwide.

England.

The educational career of the English secondary school teacher is marked by an emphasis on discipline-based academic studies, even within the context of professional studies courses. Pursuit of the PGCE presupposes the completion of a bachelor's degree. And undergraduate, not

to mention secondary, education in England is specialized. Students are generally admited to an academic department, not to the institution as a whole. Undergraduate studies are heavily concentrated in one disciplinary field.

The B.Ed. course is also colored by an emphasis on "university standard" work in academic main studies. This is particularly true of B.Ed. courses offered in colleges and institutes of higher education.

But the organizational setting can make a difference. Polytechnic B.Ed. courses tend to concentrate more heavily on professional studies (Robinson 1973; Ross 1973; Scotland 1973). For instance, they may offer coursework related to the different organizational settings in which teachers will work and the special problems they will face.

However, professionally oriented programs of teacher education are a small part of English teacher education. They represent a minority of places even in the public sector institutions.

The professional studies component of the PGCE and B.Ed. courses are profoundly influenced by the academic disciplines. In England, as in the United States, a number of disciplines (psychology, sociology, history, and philosophy) have entered and fragmented teacher education. Educational studies and theory are separated into educational psychology, educational sociology, etc. (Kotasek 1972). Psychology is the dominant discipline in English teacher education (see, for example, Cane 1968).

There is a basic contrast, however, in the extent to which the disciplines affect professional studies. The study of teaching methods in English teacher training courses is oriented to a particular subject. Such courses can also be found in American teacher education programs. But there one also finds more of an emphasis on general methods classes,

something that is relatively new to England and is still a very minor part of the training course (see, for example, Hirst 1980). In England the primacy of discipline and subject is striking even in training professionals in certain methods. Indeed, the methods teachers in the various subjects have been said to be the most dominant figures in the PGCE course, and they are characterized by a strong subject orientation (Watson 1980).

United States

At first glance it appears that the emphasis in American teacher education is on the other end of the continuum, on professional concerns. But there is a mythology concerning the supposed professional emphasis in American teacher education.[17] The major part of a future teacher's higher educational career is spent in academically oriented studies, and in courses that are professionally oriented only in name.

Nevertheless, there are significant differences in the academic emphases characterizing American versus English teacher education. First, undergraduate education in the United States is not nearly so specialized as in English higher education, nor is it so dominated by academic disciplines. Rather, there is more of an emphasis on general, liberal education, though decidedly more in some settings than in others.[18] And there is overwhelming agreement as to the importance of this general education background for the future schoolteacher, elementary and secondary. It is regarded as a critical component of the future teachers' educational career.

Second, although a bachelor's degree is essential for secondary schoolteaching in the United States, it need not precede professional

studies. Professional studies in the United States are generally included as part of the bachelor's degree, rather than being an "end-on" element taken after completion of the bachelor's. For American secondary school teachers, coursework in pedagogy is required to be a certain percentage of the bachelor's in various American states - 30 percent in Alabama, 25 percent in Florida, 20 percent in New Jersey, 15 percent in Washington, 14 percent in Texas, and 13 percent in Illinois (Feistritzer 1983). A high school teacher of mathematics can do less undergraduate work in mathematics than a regular mathematics major. And some of the mathematics classes that teacher takes may be different from those taken by regular mathematics majors.

Exceptions to this pattern of concurrent professional and academic undergraduate education underscore the rule. Only two states - (Colorado and Connecticut) - require more than a bachelor's degree for an initial teaching certificate. A few others, such as California, encourage future teachers to get their teaching certificate in a postgraduate course by making the academic subject preparation requirements so stiff that it is difficult to complete the necessary professional courses while getting the bachelor's degree.[19] A recent nationwide survey (National Center for Education Statistics 1983) revealed that about 5 percent of the schools, colleges or departments of education have extended their teacher education programs from four to five years.

What is a minor and very recent route in England - the B.Ed., including professional studies in the bachelor's - in the United States is virtually <u>the</u> route.

Despite this pattern of concurrent study, it is somewhat misleading to speak in absolute terms of an emphasis on professional concerns. The

exact percentages vary state by state, but professors in departments, schools, and colleges of education are directly responsible for only about 20-25 percent of the instruction offered to secondary school teachers (Clark and Marker 1975). Though it is less specialized and less extensive than in England, the major part of a future teacher's higher education in the United States is provided by faculty who have no formal responsibilities for teacher education. These faculty cannot be expected to tailor their classes to the concerns and needs of future teachers.

As in England, the professional studies curriculum in American teacher education is increasingly organized around academic fields of interest rather than professional areas of concern. But in addition to the dominant discipline of psychology, sociology, philosophy, and history have made greater inroads in the professional studies coursework of American than of English teacher education. Foundations and professional studies courses organized around these subjects are generally oriented more to academic than to professional concerns. This is a basic complaint of students, who in the United States are most critical of this part of their preparation (Goodlad 1970; 1983; Lortie 1975).

Professional concerns in teacher education are articulated primarily by education professors, not by teachers.[20] Even the practical, methods courses are devised by professors in higher education, not by professional practitioners in the schools. These education professors are distinct from letters and science faculty. But they are also distinct from schoolteachers. And the interests and concerns they represent are their own, not those of practitioners of the profession.

Intra-national similarity, the United States. The basic elements of the formal teacher education program are common to virtually all of the organizational settings in which American secondary school teachers are trained.[21] These are: a general liberal arts education with specialization in one subject area; general professional studies courses; methods courses (general and in one's field of specialization); and a period of student teaching.

There are state by state differences in the proportion of time devoted to each of these elements. There are also differences between institutions and by state in the specific courses offered and required within each of these categories.[22] Finally, there are some rough differences between types of institutions both in how much time is devoted to professional studies relative to general education and study in a field of specialization, and in what sequence these studies are pursued. At some large universities, for instance, professional studies are only one-fifth of the student's course load, pursued after the four years leading up to a bachelor's. The typical state college pattern is for professional studies to account for nearly one-half of the course load, and for them to be pursued from the first year of college. The common pattern in multipurpose universities is for about one-third of the course load to be professional studies, undertaken only in the last two years of college (Haberman and Stinnett 1973).

But the basic elements of the formal teacher education program are omnipresent. Does this belie the importance of teacher education's organizational setting?

Normative Setting

The importance of teacher education's organizational location is that it is linked to the "atmosphere" or "organizational climate" in which prospective teachers are trained.

The organizationally diverse location of teacher training in American higher education translates into markedly diverse normative settings for teacher training. Even when teacher training is "inside" universities organizationally, there is great variety in these institutions' norms. In England, on the other hand, the organizational location of teacher training provides for relatively similar normative settings. Even that portion of secondary school teacher training that is "outside" the university sector organizationally is "inside" it normatively.

What is basic to professional socialization is not simply or even primarily the formal curriculum. Informal and extra-curricular features of the college environment are influential features of the training period. Important factors are informal staff-student interactions, student peer group interaction, the background and activities of the faculty, and the nature of the student population (Becker et al., 1961; Cohen 1973; Clark and Marker 1975). These individuals help create the expectations that the future teacher is confronted with. And the organizational setting affects the extent to which students will be willing and able to meet these expectations by virtue of the physical and cultural resources it provides, as well as the reward system it offers and the institutional mission it pursues. All of these elements contribute to and are a part of the normative setting in which future professsionals are socialized.

The normative setting further shapes professional socialization by affecting the nature of the formal teacher training curriculum in two ways. First, it is linked to differing emphases on the general education, specialized studies, and professional studies components of the future teacher's higher education coursework. Second, the normative setting affects not only the balance between these three components, it also affects the content of each of them. In different normative settings very different content can be offered in courses with similar names. And this applies not just to differing academic and professional emphases in the professional studies curriculum, but also to different sorts of academic coursework.

United States

The relative similarity of teacher education programs across institutions in the United States in terms of the formal curriculum is less important than the distinctive normative settings these institutions provide. These settings shape both the coursework and the broader educational experience to which future teachers are exposed. Yet admidst this diversity American teacher education is characterized by a dichotomous division of labor embedded within these normative settings.

Coursework. The balance of professional studies and academic components varies by institutional type. In large research universities the academic components tend to be emphasized far more. In state colleges - which generally are former teachers colleges - the professional component accounts for a greater proportion of the future teacher's coursework, though the academic component still accounts for a majority of the time (Haberman and Stinnett 1973).

Varied settings also contribute to the different curricular content that underlies superficially similar courses.[23] For instance, almost all teacher education programs offer social foundations courses as a basic part of the professional studies component. In research universities these courses are likely to be organized around specialized disciplinary theories, issues, and problems. In other colleges and universities the emphasis is likely to be on the practical application of selected disciplinary knowledge to particular professional problems. Within the constraints of the same formal professional studies curriculum some teachers may seek to foster students' academic understanding whereas others may concentrate more on developing students' ability to perform specific professional tasks. This makes for a fundamental difference in the structure and content of courses.

The nature of academic studies also varies by normative settings. Specialized study in large research universities is likely to be quite different from such work in comprehensive state colleges and universities. For example, an English "major" may do similar amounts of coursework in English at the two types of institutions, but the nature of the work may differ. In the former, coursework will consist almost exclusively of literature classes. In the latter, it may include classes in speech, composition, drama, and the foundations of language (Conant 1963:105-5).

The balance of courses and the course content reflect the kind of work that is valued and rewarded in different institutions. Specialized disciplinary concerns dominate at the top. Although these concerns may not be absent in institutions on other rungs of the ladder, problem oriented and professional concerns of how to apply knowledge in practice receive more attention.

Institutional Culture. In the United States teacher education takes place in institutions with qualitatively different staffs, student bodies, resources, incentive structures and missions. This affects not only the formal coursework but also the culture of the school.

As one moves up the prestige hierarchy of higher education institutions an academic ideology and an academic mission organized around the creation of knowledge are prevalent. In the upper tiers of American higher education staff in schools and departments of education are drawn more from the disciplines than from the schools or departments of education, or from the schools themselves. Hiring and promotion are based more on research productivity than on teaching or professional service criteria, if the latter are accorded any importance at all. Criteria are quite similar to those for faculty in letters and science departments, from which many education staff are drawn and to which some have joint appointments.

As a result, in these upper tier schools the education staff's ideas about education and professional education, about what type of content has value and how it should be taught, are not so unlike those of their letters and science colleagues. They value education and academic, theoretical knowledge over "mechanical," skills-oriented training, and they believe it is best transmitted through abstract instruction. They favor academic coursework in the university to apprenticeship in the schools or in higher education. For professional education is conceptualized as a process of creating critical thinking professionals who will transform and improve professional practices.

Students also contribute to the normative setting. In large research universities students are able to decide on teaching as a career late in

their course of study. As a result, much of the future teacher's undergraduate work is done alongside students going on to graduate schools in the various disciplines. Coursework with fellow future teachers is pushed off to the end of one's college career.

This is less and less the case as one moves down the higher education hierarchy. In these institutions students take education coursework earlier. Many of their peers are also future schoolteachers, making for a more professionally oriented normative setting.

Dichotomous division of labor. There is a dichotomous division of labor in American higher education between teacher education settings where a lot of research is done, and those where the emphasis is on turning out schoolteachers. Schools and departments of education involved in knowledge production are distinct from those involved in teacher production (Howey 1983). In most elite schools of education more energy is directed to studying teachers (and schools and education), than to preparing them (Judge 1982).

Teacher education in the United States lies largely outside the research university, organizationally and normatively. Many elite research universities such as Yale have no schools of education. In others, such as Harvard, the schools of education have moved into research and the graduate training of staff that support and administer teachers in the schools. They have moved away from the training of teachers (Dill 1984).

Less than 10 percent of the country's education faculty are located in schools or departments of education that can be typified as research oriented (Clark and Guba 1977). When asked if there was a formal relationship between their teacher education programs and some type of formalized

research and development organization, only about one in five faculty responded that there was such a link. And the preparation programs that prepare the largest number of teachers are the least likely type of programs to have any type of formal research and development linakge - only 8 percent in the case of secondary teacher training (Howey 1983).

It is not simply a matter of institutional characteristics. Teacher education faculty are relatively uninvolved in knowledge production. A small proportion of the education professors in the country account for most of the knowledge production. And most of the persons directly involved in teacher preparation are not members of the American Educational Research Association (Joyce and Clift 1984).

Knowledge production and teacher production are not mutually exclusive. But most teachers are trained in an environment that is divorced from the pursuit of new knowledge. Although this does not mean that teacher education programs in schools and departments of education principally involved in teacher production are untouched by research, it does mean that the two functions are isolated from one another organizationally. In a unit principally engaged in teacher production, even if the formal curriculum incorporates or refers to some research data, or adopts newly researched techniques, future teachers are still trained in a normative setting devoid of active involvement in research.

England

Teacher education for secondary school teachers in England takes place largely within the university sector, both organizationally and normatively. The different organizational settings that exist are counterbalanced by normative similarities, reflected in the coursework.

University coordination has contributed to the relative commonality of normative settings.

Coursework. Institutional stratification - horizontally, across the binary line, and to the limited extent it exists vertically - is not replicated in systematically different PGCE courses. PGCE programs offered in the university sector emphasize specialized academic studies, and involve academically oriented work even in professional studies courses. This is also characteristic of PGCE courses in the public sector.

In the case of B.Eds., different organizational settings do translate to some extent into different normative settings with different kinds of coursework. Public sector B.Ed. courses that are validated by the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) rather than by universities tend to be more innovative in structure and content and more professional in emphasis (Robinson 1973:124,129; Lynch 1979:25).[24] However, most public sector B.Eds are validated by universities. They are university awards approved through normal university machinery. This university control, which until recently was effected through Area Training Organizations and Institutes of Education, ensured that these would be more academic than professional degrees.[25]

The academic bias in the B.Ed. course is evident in that B.Ed. students on the 4-year course often go the last year and a half without doing practice teaching in the schools (Lynch 1979:27). Like other university degrees, B.Eds. are oriented to developing students' academic skills. As one student wrote, "[I]t is an 'Education' degree, a degree for brighter teachers, a University degree, not a degree of the Teaching profession" (Catling 1971:27).

University norms penetrated and dominated the B.Ed., preventing it from becoming truly a professional degree for teaching.

CNAA validated B.Eds are a recent development that still make up but a small minority of the B.Ed. courses (Lynch 1979). Only in the mid-1970s were more than a few courses validated in this manner. And compared to American teacher education even these courses are biased towards academic work. The study of several academic "main subjects" is a major element of these courses stressed throughout the future teacher's studies (Lynch 1979). Educational studies have become more specialized around academic subjects and more oriented towards a range of disciplinary theory. And syllabuses for these courses often resemble those of honours degree courses in the appropriate subject (Stones 1981).

The structure of the CNAA reflects this academic bias. The Council has five major committees that consider policy and course proposals. One of them is the Committee for Education. The detailed work takes place in the subject boards and panels of these five committees. As the name connotes, these boards and panels are subject-based. There is a conspicuous absence of a "Professional Studies Board" (Lynch 1979).

In sum, in England "[T]he academic subject tail is undoubtedly wagging the pedagogical dog for many intending teachers . . ." (Stones 1981:317).

Normative similarities. There are definite differences in the institutional culture of the public sector and university settings of English secondary school teacher training. But there are pervasive, strong normative similarities across these settings, grounded in the aspirations and commitments of staff and students throughout the English higher education system.

Polytechnics and colleges of higher education provide different environments than universities. Their staff and student bodies are different, as are their missions, at least on paper. The faculty of universities have substantially better qualifications than public sector staff in terms of first class honours degrees. University faculties have proportionately more senior grade staff, and these staff are more involved in research (Scott 1983). University students tend to have higher academic qualifications than public sector students (measured by achievement on the General Certificate of Education (GCE) examinations taken at the end of secondary education). Public sector institutions are intended to be oriented more to teaching at the undergraduate level, and less to research and particularly postgraduate work.

But sectoral differences should not be overemphasized. Most secondary school teachers, particulary specialist teachers, are trained in the university sector. Moreover, differences between the two sectors are differences of degree, not of kind. The dichotomy that exists administratively and politically is not replicated educationally and normatively. These sectors lie on the same continuum.

University norms tend to dominate the non-university sector of higher education. For instance, practices in the polytechnics have drifted towards those of the university sector. A strong research culture has developed in many polytechnics, particularly in the more "successful" ones (Scott 1983).

This has been encouraged by external validating bodies like the CNAA. But it has also been born of the aspirations of polytechnic staff, the majority of whom not only aspire to but are involved in research, (although less so than in universities). It has been further

reinforced by the flow of personnel from universities to public sector institutions, including in the area of Education (Taylor 1969:213). Finally, the introduction of the B.Ed. in the public sector has resulted in the hiring of staff with more traditional academic qualifications and interests. For validation of these degrees has been contingent on public sector institutions having "qualified" staff.

Public sector students have lower academic qualifications than university students. But a considerable number of them aspire to university-type work. Many originally applied to universities. And generally they have minimum level qualifications and education similar to university students.

In a number of respects, then, different organizational settings between sectors are not indicative of normatively distinct settings.

University coordination. Due in part to the coordination of secondary school teacher training between university and public sector settings there is no dichotomous division of labor in England between knowledge production and teacher production. Until the mid-1970s this coordination was provided essentially by universities. For two decades prior to the 1944 McNair Report the mechanism was Joint Examining Boards that supervised syllabuses and conducted examinations in teacher training colleges. From the McNair Report up to the mid-1970s the mechanism was Area Training Organizations (ATOs), the validation work of which was coordinated by university institutes of education. Both mechanisms were dominated by universities (Hilliard 1969; Niblett et al., 1975; Turner 1976; Lynch 1979).

Direct university oversight of public sector secondary school teacher training has since been somewhat reduced. And CNAA coordination

has been introduced. But university coordination has continued on an ad hoc basis, through so-called "rump ATOs" (Taylor 1981).

University coordination has ensured that secondary school teachers trained in settings outside the university organizationally are not isolated from it normatively, from either university values or knowledge production. Even barring this coordination, public sector institutions often and increasingly encompass some knowledge production function. And although in many cases substantial knowledge production is lacking, a positive valuation of this dimension is not.

Due to the nature of England's higher education sector there is also no division of labor, equivalent to that described in American universities, between knowledge producing and teacher producing institutions. Research is an integral part of all universities' mission, on paper and in practice. As England lacks functionally distinct sectors of universities, so it lacks functionally distinct sectors of schools and institutes of education.

Most university schools of education are deeply involved in training teachers, with the largest single group of students being those training to be teachers (Wragg 1981:109). In the United States, the higher the status of the university the less likely it is to be involved in teacher training. In England the best universities have not turned away from training teachers to embrace other missions such as research and the training of educational administrators.

The University of London is the leader in teacher training. And Cambridge is among the leaders in terms of numbers of teacher training students. Oxford plays a somewhat smaller role in terms of student numbers but is still substantially involved in teacher education (Wragg 1981).

Finally, education units are staffed by persons who share some basic commonalities with other university staff. Education staff spend less time on research, and more of them engage in no research, than other university staff. But two-thirds of them have published at least one article in a specialized education journal in the last five years (Taylor 1965). Education staff had fewer first class honours degrees and fewer of them came from the most elite universities. But 25 percent of them got their first degree from Oxford or Cambridge, and 40 percent of them had first class honours degrees- compared to 68 percent in Humanities, 63 percent in Science, and 47 percent in Social Studies (Taylor 1965). What is remarkable is not the difference between education and other staff, but rather the level of achievement of the educaton staff.

In English teacher education the emphasis is on academic excellence. Across minimally diverse organizational and normative settings there is a common commitment to a specialized discipline-based undergraduate and professional studies work that is linked to research. University and CNAA coordination ensures that high standards of academic quality in these settings are maintained.

The education of American secondary school teachers involves more emphasis on professional studies than in the case in England. But the major portion of a future secondary school teacher's education in the United States is in academic subjects.

However, the nature of this academic emphasis differs from that in England. A conventional notion of academic excellence is neither emphasized nor safeguarded. The great variety of organizational and normative settings in which teacher education takes place translates

into a lack of common commitment to a particular kind of academic work. Different colleges and universities in the United States have different missions. Academic work is therefore differentially emphasized and differentially interpreted in these different settings. Lacking coordination between different institutions and different sectors, a dichotomous division of labor has developed between knowledge production and teacher production. This means that despite the bias in American teacher education towards conventional academic work, most teachers are not trained in settings that are either organizationally or normatively inside the research university, where traditional academic ideology and functions are dominant.

The Costs of Academic Excellence

What outcomes are associated with these two systems of teacher education, for teachers and the schools? The presumed benefits of emphasizing and enforcing academic excellence in teacher education along the lines of the English system are familiar to all and accepted by most. Proponents of this approach in its various forms assume that academically more rigorous teacher education programs will make for better teachers and thus better schools. Research supporting these assumptions is lacking.[26]

The research needed would first have to identify the dominant value systems in teacher education settings, then relate these to actual practices in these settings, and then examine the extent to which individual students' orientations to teaching are shaped by these settings (Taylor 1969). Finally, there is the question of how lasting these effects are, especially given the data that reveal how much of professional education's

effect on student attitudes is "washed out" by the socialization the professional undergoes on the job (see, for instance, Becker et al., 1961; Wiseman and Start 1965; Hoy 1967; Horowitz 1968; Zeichner and Tabachnick 1981; and Johnston and Ryan 1983).

These tasks are beyond the scope of this paper, though I have attempted to examine the organizational and normative location of teacher education and have touched upon what these mean for the teacher education program. What ensues are basically suggestive remarks constituting initial steps in fashioning a conceptual framework for further investigating the effects of teacher education's location.

Professional Socialization and Professional Preparation

Professional education is geared to socializing students into the role of a professional. When effective it imbues the student with an identity and orientation that guides their performance of the professional role. Professional education also involves preparing students to deal effectively with the challenges and problems they will confront as professionals.

Academics versus teachers. The English pattern of teacher education leads students to identify themselves more as academics or intellectuals than as teachers. Prospective teachers are trained as academic subject specialists. For most prospective teachers professional studies are not introduced until after at least two or three years of intensive study within one discipline. Even then, professional studies characteristically involve discipline-based academic work. The normative settings in which this work is undertaken are characterized by a traditional academic ideology.

With this sort of preparation teachers tend to see their function as one of preparing students in their specialty. The subject matter that was the dominant feature of their education, often going back to their secondary school days, dominates their teaching. They are committed to teaching their specialty to those who are bright enough to assimilate the subject matter. And this preparation is geared to the future specialized study of the subject.

This orientation that is characteristic of many teachers is linked to some of the fundamental problems of English secondary education. The nature of future teachers' education may not have caused or created these problems. But it contributes to their perpetuation and sometimes helps impede efforts to change secondary schooling.

For decades reform efforts have tried to overcome what is perceived as the principal deficiency of English secondary education, the entrapment of the curriculum in subject specialisms. On a general, abstract level many educators agree that there is much agreement that there is too much specialization too early. But a number of factors at the operational level contribute to its continuation.

Apart from the incentive systems confronting secondary schools in both their financing and the entrance system of universities, there are the inclinations of the teachers themselves.[27] Just as university professors have demonstrated a natural preference for teaching the subjects in which they were trained, thereby undercutting efforts to promote interdisciplinary work, so secondary school teachers want to teach in the subjects in which they were trained. They defend a curriculum grounded in narrow, single subject-based study thereby inhibiting the broadening of secondary schooling (see, for example, Corbett 1971:20; Maden 1983).

Within the past ten years there has been a drastic change in the organization of the English secondary school system. In 1970 pupils in maintained (state) secondary schools in England were distributed between comprehensive (31 percent), modern (41 percent), grammar (20 percent), and technical and other (8 percent) schools. By 1980, 88 percent of the students in maintained secondary schools were in comprehensives (Brock 1981).

But this reorganization of the structure of secondary schooling has not rid the English system of early specialization. The internal structures, processes, and practices of the comprehensive schools replicate the old divisions in the secondary sector (Ball 1981; Brock 1981). A 1978 survey by Her Majesty's Inspectorate (DES 1978) revealed continued early selection and segregation. The grammar school tradition's academic ideology (subject versus pupil centered, and academic versus pastoral centered) dominates most comprehensive schools (Ball 1981). Teachers pursue the same preferences and operate on the basis of the same orientations within the context of different organizational structures.

So work within the schools continues to be skewed towards preparation for future specialized study, despite the fact that less than 20 percent of the age cohort will go on to higher education. Other possible functions of the secondary school are downplayed in practice by teachers committed to a certain kind of schooling. Even internal tracks that do not generally lead to the university are influenced by the preparatory curriculum and exams (Brock 1981; DES 1982). Rather than providing students not headed for higher education with an alternative form of secondary education, the English system tends to provide them with a watered down version of the specialized, academic curriculum.

The irony is, the more that secondary school teachers take on the identity and preferences of university academics, in some ways the less willing they are to undertake some of the essential tasks involved in preparing students for study in higher education. For instance, in the early 1960s a number of English universities sought to implement what was called a "Use of English" test that was to be required for university entry. The universities were dissatisfied with the English skills of entering students. They wanted the schools to better prepare students in the competent use of language. Secondary school teachers strongly opposed this (Montgomery 1967:165). They were interested in teaching their subjects, and English usage was not a subject. The specialization perpetuated by university-based and influenced teacher education contributed to teachers' unwillingness to undertake the function that universities wanted the schools to perform.

Academic versus professional preparation. The emphasis on academic excellence has tended to minimize the amount of attention devoted to developing professional competence. Little attention is devoted to preparing future teachers for the professional problems they will confront. Professional competence is essentially equated with teachers' academic knowledge and expertise, as is true with university academics.

As a result, teachers are ill-equipped to address the needs of an increasingly large and heterogeneous student body, encompassing students of a wide range of abilities, interests, and backgrounds. Their teaching and curriculum are ill-suited to the majority of English secondary school students. Nor are they prepared to function effectively in the organizational settings they will work in.

Prospective teachers are educated and trained as if they are going to become self-sufficient, independent tutors of academic subjects. The integration of academic knowledge with the realities and contingencies of professional practice is left to the individual.[28]

Inadequate socialization. In England the educational process provides a relatively effective socialization experience. Future teachers are socialized primarily as academic specialists. In the United States the educational process provides an inadequate socialization experience. Future teachers are socialized neither as academics nor into the role of teaching professional.

The major portion of future secondary school teachers' higher education in the United States consists of academic coursework outside of professional studies. But American undergraduates do not specialize as early and as exclusively in the study of one subject as they do in England. English undergraduates specialize from the start in a subject which they also studied intesively at the secondary level. American undergraduates commonly change their "major" (specialty) a number of times, often as late as their junior year. And due to "breadth requirements" much of their coursework is outside their major (in different subjects and different subject groupings - for example Social Sciences, Humanities, Life Sciences). Socialization into the role of academic specialist takes place more at the graduate than the undergraduate level in the United States. And most future teachers do not go beyond the bachelor's degree.

Professional concerns and professional studies receive far more attention in the United States than in England. But they are still a

minor part of the future teacher's higher education career. And these are professional concerns and studies as interpreted and applied by teacher education staff, not by teachers. The work offered is largely theoretical in nature, consisting of the academic study of professional matters. As in England, it is left to the individual to integrate the abstract knowledge learned in these courses with the problems of professional practice.

Inadequate preparation. There is no emphasis on academic excellence in American teacher education. Nevertheless, an academic bias exists. It is of a different sort than in England, but it inhibits the development of a more professionally oriented teacher education program.

American teacher education students are better prepared in professional studies than British students. Although British students score higher on intelligence and verbal comprehension tests than American students, they score lower on measures of professional knowledge - such as child development, educational psychology, guidance and measurement (Cohen 1973).[29] But such tests measure knowledge of subject matter, not the students' capacity to apply it, and not, for that matter, the utility of this knowledge for teachers.

There is no evidence that this knowledge helps students become more effective teachers. Quite the contrary. Recall that it is the educational studies courses that have been most criticized by American teachers, as well as by academics outside of teacher education. The basic criticism are that this coursework is "too theoretical," "not practical enough," and/or that it is "too soft."

It is the academic nature of this work that hampers its utility for future professionals. The separation of theory from practice in the

teacher education program means that although students may learn educational theory they do not learn to apply it to their professional work (see, for example, Bartholemew 1976). Such teacher education programs do not link the educational ideology they aim to transmit to students feasible teaching methods and practices. Nor do they verse students in these practices or generate their confidence in them.

American teachers may not be inadequately prepared in terms of academic knowledge about professional matters. But just as they are inadequately socialized into the role of a teaching professional, they are inadequately prepared as professionals. For the essence of professionalism is not to simply know, but to know how, and when.

This inadequate socialization and preparation has obvious educational costs which are clear to current critics of American teacher education and American high schools.

Conclusion

Teacher education is "between two worlds" - higher education and the schools. But the demands of the higher education world prevail. There is a school-based component in American and English teacher education programs, but it is a very minor part of the future teacher's education and is not integrated with the student's academic work.

However, the nature of these "higher education worlds" in the United States and England varies dramatically, as does the location of teacher education. Organizationally and normatively, American teacher education is inside various higher education worlds, but is outside the research university world. Teacher education in England, on the other hand, is organizationally and normatively primarily in the university

sector. And there is one, relatively undifferentiated university world in England, a world in which the various individual universities are "driven by the same sort of engine even if their coachwork varies somewhat."[30]

The educational and professional costs of this differential location for teacher education programs and students are distinctive. The pull of the higher education world has brought about the dominance of academic models of teacher education. But the nature of these models is quite different.

In the United States, nationwide commonalities in the formal teacher education curriculum are skewed. Different organizational settings provide different normative environments. The nature of these environments, shaped by factors outside the formal curriculum, make for different emphasis and content within the formal curriculum.

The model is academic. But academic excellence is not emphasized. Much of the teacher education lies outside the most selective institutions.

Nor is purely academic work as separated and emphasized relative to professional studies as is the case in England. American teacher educators, more so than their English counterparts, have been able to build an educational domain over which they have considerable control. But in seeking to improve their status within the university and in higher education as a whole teacher educators have constructed a program of professional studies for future teachers that is oriented towards academic-type work. This is an essential part of the academic bias in the American model of teacher education.

The costs for future teachers are high. Most of their higher education consists of academic work apart from professional studies.

But this academic work ranges across a number of fields, as well as across a range of normative settings. The result is that they are not socialized into academic subject specialists. They identify themselves more as teachers than as academics involved in the intellectual life of their subject.

Yet American teacher education students are inadequately socialized and prepared as teachers. The minor part of their higher education which consists of professional education is oriented to academic-type work. This does not promote the development of a professional identity, and it detracts from the pursuit of practical, professionally oriented work.

The academic model of secondary school teacher education in England is quite different. More than just academic-type work is emphasized. The emphasis on academic excellence and the maintenance of standards that is the hallmark of the higher educational system marks teacher education as well. Academic excellence is demanded of the teacher education unit by the rest of the university, in its entrants, staff, and programs. And these units are housed within the most prestigious of England's universities.

Specialized, purely academic work takes place before professional studies and is emphasized to the extreme. Most secondary school teachers are trained in one-year postgraduate courses. And the professional studies are marked even more than in the United States by discipline-based concerns.

The academic model that prevails in England is a discipline-based academic model. The pull of the discipline, and the demand for excellence within the discipline, are powerful.

The result of this model is that teacher education students are socialized first as academic subject specialists and only secondarily as teachers. And their preparation is overwhemingly academic. Problems of professional practice are of peripheral concern even in much of the professional education program.

Both the English and American academic models of teacher education have undermined reforms geared to improve teaching and the schools. A basic problem is that both models inhibit or fail to contribute to the development of teachers who are excellently prepared professionally.

The English case suggests that to emphasize subject study to the further exclusion of professionally oriented work is no solution. Secondary school teachers in England receive intensive and excellent academic preparation in the subjects they are to teach. But this academic preparation is linked to the early and intense specialization that continues to fragment English secondary education and make it irrelevant to the large majority of students. Teachers prepared as academic specialists have played an important part in undermining reforms geared to broaden the curriculum and mission of English secondary education. In the context of American high schools, which cater to a larger and more heterogeneous student body, such preparation would be inappropriate.

Preparing future teachers only in the subject matter they will teach leaves them professionally unprepared to teach that subject to students with a broad range of interests, ability, and destinations. For professors in the disciplines are interested in preparing future academics, not future schoolteachers.

> Academic faculties almost invariably specify the courses to be taken in a field of concentration in such a way that their graduates can proceed in the same field to graduate study leading to a Ph.D. More often than not, such a pattern of studies is not suitable for a future high school teacher. (Conant 1963:169-170).

For instance, an English major at a good university does not take coursework that would be critical for a good high school English teacher (for instance, grammar and the structure of language, speech and drama, and composition.

The English case also suggests, however, that demanding academic excellence in teacher education programs may be an equally ineffective solution. For British teachers have the same complaints as American teachers about professional studies in education. They are critical of the theoretical emphasis of educational discipline courses in psychology and sociology (Leeds University Institute of Education 1974). And while almost all graduate teachers agreed it was essential to try to understand their pupils, only 28 percent believed that their educational psychology courses had helped them in this regard (Rousseau 1968).[31]

The academic models of teacher education ignore the little that we know about learning. They are biased towards abstract, academic work undertaken by means of traditional teaching methods. But research has indicated that "when teachers are treated [that is, taught] in the same wy they are supposed to treat their pupils, they are more likely to adopt the desired style of teaching behavior" (Haberman and Stinnett 1973:117). The method of coursework in teacher education may be at least as important as its content. For example, a sample of teacher education students asked about the causes of changes in their attitudes

towards teaching were more likely to mention the method used by their teacher education instructors than the course content (Brimm 1966). In both England and the United States teacher education has attempted to change tradition by traditional methods.

So teacher education students are inclined to do as their professors do, not as they say. And what their professors do is to perpetuate conventional academic patterns of teaching. Research has indicated that, "direct involvement in the role to be learned . . . produces the desired teaching behavior more effectively than remote or abstract experiences such as lectures on instructional theory" (Haberman and Stinnett 1973:117). Academic courswork is a relatively ineffective means of changing behavior. Yet schools of education continue to transmit innovative techniques of teaching and learning (such as Dewey's "learning by doing") to their students on the blackboard and through lectures and other traditional forms of instruction.[32]

No matter how eloquently they have spoken for change, teacher educators have not in their practices challenged coventional patterns of teaching. In this sense, higher education-based teacher education has not provided a liberalizing influence, as is often assumed. Rather, it has simply reinforced and further legitimated the status quo (see, for instance, Zeichner and Tabachnick 1981).[33] The more discipline-based academic model in England goes one step further, perpetuating not only the pedagogical but the curricular status quo of narrow, subject-based study.

Teacher education in the United States is already marked by an academic bias in the coursework it offers future teachers. This detracts from the effectiveness of teacher educators seeking to change and improve teaching practice.

The promotion of academic excellence either in prospective teachers' preparation in an academic subject or in the teacher education program (academically better staff and students and more demanding curricula), is not sufficient to improve teaching. For the problem lies in the emphasis on things academic,and the equating of academic attainment with professional ability.

Endemic to professional education is the tension between academic and professional elements and concerns, and the confusion of the two. Teacher educators must accord more attention to purely professional elements, setting aside for the moment their drive for academic respectability.

Consider the efforts of American teacher educators to develop a knowledge base concerning teaching. The search for this knowledge base takes place largely through academic research. The goal of this research into teaching and learning is to generate good abstract theories of teaching that can then be transmitted to students through conventional coursework. But this knowledge will not be translated into professional practice until it is instilled through professional practice.

Professional practice, at least in professions like teaching and medicine that deal with human beings, requires the use of professional judgment in the application of abstract, theoretical knowledge. Professional knowledge is built though the personal experience of individual practitioners as they confront each unique case. This professional knowledge is largely case specific. Generalizations are tentative because each case is different and must be treated individually. In teaching, for example, each student responds differently to various pedagogical methods, just as in medicine each patient responds differently to various medications and procedures.

Academics search for generalizations. Exceptions only prove the rule. For professionals, exceptions are the rule.

The professional identity of "teacher" is not fostered by abstractly teaching students academic theories of professional practice. For these theories are in many ways necessarily irrelevant to specific cases and thus are inadequate for the solving of professional problems. Teacher education programs organized around this kind of work and knowledge do not address what is critical to the forging of professional identity - the exercising of professional judgment in a number of different situations. The knowledge base and identity of the professional is born not of academic study but of personal experience.[34]

The cost of promoting academic excellence in American teacher education is that critical professional concerns will continue to be ignored. This will set rather narrow limits on reformers' ability to improve secondary education. American teacher education may be inadequate, but it is not unimportant. Both by what it does and by what it does not do, American teacher education contributes to the perpetuation of what is believed to be an inadequate pattern of secondary education.

The key is not to make teacher education more academically anything. Rather, as a form of professional education, teacher education must come to grips with two kinds of knowledge and ability - professional and academic - and with how to relate and integrate them. Teacher education must clarify and concern itself with what features of each are critical to the formation of good teaching professionals. And the current imbalance between the two worlds that tug at teacher education must be redressed, though not reversed.

Footnotes

1) See Sykes (1983) for a discussion of some of these.

2) See, for example, New Jersey Governor Thomas H. Kean's proposal that campus-based teacher education with courses in educational methodology no longer be required for certification (Chronicle of Higher Education, February 15, 1984a).

3) The immediate connotation of "costs" is financial, or even political. For instance, if teacher education is going to attract more academically able students, or likewise, if teacher education programs are going to be extended in length and thus demand more of students, then teaching as a career is going to have to offer better financial rewards (Sykes 1983). On the political side, the political costs for state education agencies to severly restrict the number of teacher training places or institutions, in the name of quality, would be extremely high (Clark and Marker 1975).

4) I am focusing on England, not Great Britain, because the Scottish system of teacher education is different from the English system. See, for instance, Scotland (1973) and Taylor (1982) on the "Scottish type" of teacher education.

5) See, for instance, Niebuhr et al. (1957) on divinity schools.

6) The length of time required for student teaching ranges from five weeks in Missouri to fifteen weeks in Delaware (Feistritszer 1983). These requirements have increased a little since the early 1960s, but there was a similar range of variance than (Conant 1963).

7) Yet the evidence is that student teaching, in the view of student teachers, is the most important, influential part of the preparation program (Rousseau 1968; Cope 1973; Haberman 1983).

8) This can be carried a step further to include pre-collegiate education, as Lortie (1975) has so convincingly done.

9) Demonstration schools for elementary school teachers are owned and run by some schools of education.

10) There are numerous classification schemes of the different sectors of American higher education. The most commonly referred to is the Carnegie Commission's breakdown of American higher education into four types of doctoral granting institutions (research university I, research university II, doctoral granting university I, and doctoral granting university II), comprehensive universities and colleges (I and II), liberal arts colleges (I and II) and two-year colleges (Carnegie Commission 1973).

11) The involvement of normal schools in preparing secondary school teachers was more a midwestern and western phenomenon, not found so much in the east and south (Harcelroad et al. 1969:24).

12) This included nearly every type of institution: 85 teachers' colleges (73 public and 12 private), 221 universities (93 public and 128 private), 891 general and liberal arts colleges (340 public and 551 private); and 122 technical schools (Stinnett 1960).

13) See American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1963) for a detailed analysis of the various organizational structures in which teacher education is performed in liberal arts colleges.

14) The English case also breaks the Continental European pattern in that university colleges and universities were involved in training elementary school teachers by the late 19th century. And prior to the Board of Education's 1911 Teacher Training Regulations these training departments were not only involved in secondary school

teacher training, they were running "concurrent" courses rather than requiring a four-year course with the first three years devoted to degree studies (Tuck 1973).

15) As in the United States, students regard practice teaching as the most important and useful part of the training program (Cohen 1973; Cope 1973).

16) Even after 1960, when for training colleges the professional course was increased from two years to three years, school practice time was only increased by two to three weeks (Cope 1973). So it has actually become proportionally a reduced part of the professional education course.

17) Dr. David O'Shea made this point at UCLA's Colloquium on the Cross-National Analysis of Higher Education.

18) There has been much talk in recent years of developing a core curriculum, a call for a return to the principles of liberal education. This is largely a reaction to the increased opportunity for students to take electives and fashion their own program of study in what some have called a cafeteria style approach to higher education. Despite this, relative to England, the coursework of an undergraduate in America is generally much broader.

19) For example, see Conant (1963:25) on the Fisher Bill in California, which became law in 1961.

20) Dr. Val Rust brought this distinction to my attention at UCLA's Colloquium on the Cross-National Analysis of Higher Education.

21) Silberman (1970) for instance, has referred to a national curriculum in teacher education.

22) See Conant (1963:265-270) for a brief discussion of the vast variety of types of educational psychology, social foundations, and other professional courses that are offered and/or required.

23) There are other dimensions of diversity which, however, do not vary systematically with institutional type. One can certainly identify different approaches to training teachers, such as micro-teaching, or different views of teachers' proper relationship with children, that distinguish institutions within as well as between higher education sectors (Haberman and Stinnett 1973:77-85).

24) The CNAA was established in 1964 to award degrees (comparable to university degrees in quality) and other qualifications to students who complete approved courses in non-university institutions of higher education in the United Kingdom. Originally the universities were heavily represented in the Council. They still have representatives. But the representation of the public sector institutions has been increased. For a description of the Council and its work see Lynch (1979:58-78).

25) The Area Training Organizations were disbanded in the mid-1970s, and were replaced by various ad hoc arrangements, what Taylor (1981) has called, "rump ATOs." Also see Lynch (1979:37) for a brief discussion of disbanding of the ATOs.

26) In fact, a recent report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) disputes the link between, on the one hand, teacher training programs that stress academic excellence in subject skills, and on the other, student achievement. Analyzing programs aimed at upgrading teacher knowledge of science or mathematics the GAO found no consistent evidence linking these programs to improved student achievement (Chronicle of Higher Education, March 14, 1984b).

27) Schools benefit financially from having 6th forms (Reid and Filby 1982). This encourages specialization at the lower secondary level to prepare students for specialized 6th form work (Maden 1983). Entrance to the university is by quality of 'A' levels on the GCE exam, and this means specialization in a few subjects. Moreover, entry is to departments in the universities, not to the university as a whole. On an abstract level universities might call for more broadly educated entrants. But departments admit students according to their level of achievement in that subject. They sometimes also consider and value specialization in a related subject. But departments effectively discourage mixed subject combinations at the secondary level.

28) Dr. David O'Shea made this point at UCLA's Colloquium on the Cross-National Analysis of Higher Education.

29) American students also scored better on biological and physical science tests.

30) Lord Eric Ashby used the engine and coachwork metaphors to describe the British university system to a group of American academics at a luncheon April 11, 1984 at UCLA.

31) Only 3 percent of grammar school heads were convinced that their educational philosophy courses (taken at the university) had changed their outlook on education. Hardly anyone had a good word to say about their history of education courses. And hardly anyone had taken educational sociology courses.

32) John Goodlad cited this illustration and made this point in a talk at the February 1984 meetings of the Sociology of Education Association in Asilomar, California.

33) It also perpetuates the status quo by failing to prepare teachers to be involved in change. Prospective teachers are not trained to become active members of the schools, working for educational change. Rather, they are encouraged, on an operational level, to "fit in."

34) The same problem applies to skills based teacher education programs. Such programs produce technicians for whom these learned skills are merely tools that they use or cast aside. Students learn how to use these tools, but they do not take on a professional identity grounded in a certain approach to professional problems and clients.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1963). Liberal arts colleges and teacher education. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Study Series No. 7). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Ball, S. J. (1981). Continuity and conflict in comprehensive schooling. Universities Quarterly, 35(2), 211-220.

Bartholemew, J. (1976). Schooling teachers: The myth of the liberal college. In G. Whitty & M. Young (Eds.), Explorations in the politics of school knowledge. Differton, England: Nafferton.

Becker, H. S., Geer, B., Hughes, E., & Strauss, A. (1961). Boys in white. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brim, B. J. (1966). Attitude changes in teacher education students. Journal of Educational Research, 59(10), 441-445.

Brock, C. (1981). Problems of articulation between secondary and higher education in England and Wales. European Journal of Education, 16(2), 153-174.

Cane, B. (1968). Teachers, teaching, and teacher education. In H. J. Butcher (Ed.), Educational research in Britain. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Company.

Carnegie Commission (1973). A classification of institutions of higher education. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Caston, G. (1979). Planning, government and administration in two university systems: California and United Kingdom. Oxford Review of Education, 5, 183-194.

Catling, S. J. (1971, Spring). The B.Ed. degree: A degree for teachers, not for teaching. Education for Teaching, 84, 21-27.

Cerych, L. (1980). Diversification: The experience in France. Universitas, 1(2), 24-35.

Chronicle of Higher Education (1984a, February). Education deans urge schools to suspend classes if they lack qualified teachers (Vol. 27, No. 23 pp. 1, 14).

----- (1984b, March). U.S. programs for math and science teachers may not aid student achievement, study says (Vol. 28, No. 23 p. 23).

----- (1984c, April). House panel urged to address needs of teacher education programs (Vol. 28, No. 6 p. 19).

Clark, B. R. (1978). United States. In J. H. Van de Graaff, B. R. Clark, D. Furth, D. Goldschmidt, & D. F. Wheeler (Ed.), Academic power: Patterns of authority in seven national systems. New York: Praeger.

----- (N.D.). Conclusions. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), The school and the university: An international perspective. Unpublished manuscript under submission.

Clark, D. L., & Marker, G. (1975). The institutionalization of teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher education (pp. 53-86). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, L. (1973). Student characteristics and attitudes in colleges of education. In D. E. Lomax (Ed.), The education of teachers in Britain (pp. 387-400). London: John Wiley and Sons.

Conant, J. B. (1963). The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Cope, E. (1973). School experience and student learning. In D. E. Lomax (ed.), The education of teachers in Britain. London: John Wiley and Sons.

Corbett, A. (1971). Innovation in education--England. Center for Research and Innovation/Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Department of Education and Science (1978). Mixed ability work in comprehensive schools. HMI Series: Matters for Discussion 6. HMSO.

----- (1982). Mathematics counts: A report of the Committee of Enquiry into the teaching of mathematics (the Cockroft Report). London: HMSO.

Dill, D. (1984, January). New strategies for schools of education ought to include schools of teaching. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 27(19), 80.

Feistritzer, C. E. (1983). The condition of teaching: A state by state analysis. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Fulton, O. (1981). Principles and policies. In O. Fulton (Ed.), Access to higher education. Guildford, Surrey: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Glazer, N. (1974). The schools of the minor professions. Minerva, 10(3), 346-364.

Goodlad, J. I. (1970). The reconstruction of teacher education. Teachers College Record, 72(1), 61-72.

----- (1983). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Haberman, M. (1983). Research on perservice laboratory and clinical experiences: Implications for teacher education. In K. R. Howey & W. E. Gardner (Eds.), The education of teachers. New York and London: Longman.

Haberman, M., & Stinnett, T. M. (1973). Teacher education and the new profession of teaching. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Harcelroad, F. F., Sagen, H., & Molen, T. (1969). The developing state colleges and universities. American College Testing Program.

Hilliard, F. [redacted] (1969). Universities and the education of teachers. Educational Review, 21(2), 83-97.

Hirst, P. H. (1980). The PGCE course and the training of specialist teachers for secondary schools. British Journal of Teacher Education, 6(1), 3-20.

Horowitz, M. (1968). Student-teaching experiences and attitudes of school teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 19, 317-324.

Howell, D. A. (1976). Systems analysis and academic decision-making in universities. Educational Administration, 4(2), 41-59.

----- (1979, Spring). Academic decision-making: The B.Ed. degree in British universities. Higher Education Review, 17-41.

Howey, K. R. (1983). Teacher education: An overview. In K. R. Howey & W. E. Gardner (Eds.), The education of teachers. New York and London: Longman.

Hoy, W. K. (1967). Organizational socialization: The student-teacher and pupil control ideology. Journal of Educational Research, 61, 153-155.

Hughes, E. C. (1963, Fall). Professions. Daedalus XCII, 4.

Johnston, J. & Ryan, K. (1983). Research on the beginning teacher: Implications for teacher education. In K. R. Howey & W. E. Gardner (Eds.), The education of teachers (pp. 136-162). New York and London: Longman.

Joyce, B., & Clift, R. (1984). The Phoenix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. Educational Researcher, 13(4), 5-19.

Judge, H. (1982). American graduate schools of education. New York: Ford Foundation.

King, E. (1982). Industrialized countries. In R. Goodings, M. Byram, & M. McPartland (Eds.), Changing priorities in teacher education. London, New York: Croom Helm, Nichols Publishing Co.

Kotasek, J. (1972). Current trends and problems in teacher education. In A. Yates (Ed.), Current problems of teacher education: Report of a Meeting of International Experts. UNESCO Institute for Education, Hamburg.

Leeds University Institute of Education (1974). Teacher education: The teachers' point of view. NFER.

Lomax, D. E. (1973). Some aspects of teacher education in Britain. In D. E. Lomax (Ed.), The education of teachers in Britain. London: John Wiley and Sons.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lynch, J. (1979). The reform of teacher education in the United Kingdom. Guildford, Surrey: The Society for Research into Higher Education.

Maden, M. (1983, July). The relation between secondary and higher education in England and Wales. Presented at UCLA Conference, The relationship between secondary and higher education.

Montgomery, R. J. (1967). Examinations. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Moodie, G., & Eustace, R. (1974). Power and authority in British univerisites. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

National Center for Education Statistics (1983). Fast response survey of teacher education: Perceptions of methods of improvement. Washington, D.C.

Niblett, W. R., & Humphreys, D. W., & Fairhurst, J. R. (1975). The university connection. NFER Publishing Company Ltd.

Niebuhr, H. R., Williams, D. D., & Gustafson, J. M. (1957). The advancement of theological education. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Perkin, H. (1969). Innovation in higher education: New Universities in the United Kingdon. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

----- (1977). The control of British higher education. Higher Education Research Group Working Paper No. 20. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University, Institute for Social and Policy Studies.

Reid, W., & Filby, J. (1982). The sixth: An essay on education and democracy. Lewes: Falmer Press.

Robinson, E. (1973). The future of teacher education in the polytechnics. In D. E. Lomax (Ed.), The education of teachers in Britain (pp. 117-131). London: John Wiley and Sons.

Ross, A. (1973). The development of teacher education in colleges of education. In D. E. Lomax (Ed.), The education of teachers in Britain. London: John Wiley and Sons.

Rousseau, H. J. (1968). The impact of educational theory on teachers. British Journal of Educational Studies, 16(1), 60-71.

Scotland, J. (1973). Teacher education in Scotland. In D. E. Lomax (Ed.), The education of teachers in Britain (pp. 37-52). London: John Wiley and Sons.

Scott, P. (1983). The state of the academic profession in Britain. European Journal of Education, 18(3), 245-257.

Silberman, C. F. (1970). Crisis in the classroom: The remaking of American education. New York: Random House.

Stinnett, T. M. (1960). Certification requirements and procedures among the states, 1960. Journal of Teacher Education, 11 (2), 173-184.

Stones, E. (1981). Teacher education and pedagogy. Journal of Education for Teachers, 7(3), 217-230.

Sykes, G. (1983, July). Teacher education in the United States. Presented at UCLA Conference, The relationship between secondary and higher education.

Taylor, W. (1965). The university teacher of education in England. Comparative Education, 1(3), 193-201.

----- (1969). Society and the education of teachers. London: Faber and Faber Ltd.

----- (1981). Teacher education into the 1990s. Educational Review, 33(2), 85-95.

----- (1982). Changing priorities in teacher education. In R. Goodings, M. Byram, & M. McPartland (Eds.), Changing priorities in teacher education. London, New York: Croom Helm, Nichols Publishing Company.

Times Higher Education Supplement (1982, September). A badly mangled degree, by P. Santinelli. No. 514.

Tuck, J. (1973). From day training college to University Department of Education. In D. E. Lomax (Ed.), The education of teachers in Britain (pp. 71-94). London: John Wiley and Sons.

Turner, J. (1976). Structure and content in teacher education in England. In D. E. Lomax (Ed.), European perspectives in teacher education (pp. 23-41). London: John Wiley and Sons.

Watson, K. (1980). Traditional or rational? Change in the Reading PGCE. In R. Alexander and J. Whittaker (Eds.), Developments in PGCE courses. Guildford, Surrey: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Wiseman, S., & Start, K. B. (1965). A follow-up of teachers five years after completing their training. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 35, 342-361.

Woodring, P. (1975). The development of teacher education. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher education (pp. 1-24). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wragg, E. C. (1981). Teacher education in the universities in the 1990s. Educational Review, 33(2), 105-114.

Zeichner, K. M., & Tabachnick, B. R. (1981). Are the effects of university teacher education 'washed out' by school experience? Journal of Teacher Education, 32(3), 7-11.